

REMARKS

Claims 1-49 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-49 stand rejected. Claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 39 are independent. Further, Claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 39 are amended herein. Claims 13, 20, 22, 24 and 27 are also amended herein. In view of the claim amendments above and the Remarks and arguments set forth below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and respectfully Request Continuing Examination.

OBJECTIONS TO DRAWINGS

Figures 1 and 2 are objected to. Responsively, Applicants respectfully submit herewith Replacement Sheets, so marked, for Figures 1 and 2 in accordance with 37 CFR §§ 1.121(d) & 1.84(c). The Replacement Sheets for Figures 1 and 2 bear the legend --(PRIOR ART)-- in compliance with MPEP § 608.02(g). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's review and approval.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

UNDER 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 12, 21, 28 and 39 are rejected under 35 USC § 112 (¶ 2) in relation to the phrase "defined master device." Claims 1, 12, 21, 28 and 39 are amended herein, all after a similar fashion as exemplified by the reproduction of Claim 1 shown below for the Examiner's convenience, with underlining added for emphasis.

1. A method for fault management in a distributed network management station comprising:
initiating a first device coupled to a network, wherein said first device comprises at least one of a single processing element device, a computing system, and a blade type computing system compliant with a compact peripheral component interconnect (PCI) chassis;
broadcasting from said first device an information packet to a plurality of devices coupled to the network, wherein said information packet helps define one of said devices a master device for said network; and
resolving status of said first device coupled to said network, wherein said resolving results in said distributed network management station having said defined master device being one of said first device and said devices.

As amended herein, Claims 1, 12, 21, 28 and 39 recite that the information packet helps define one of said devices as a master device for the network.

Applicants respectfully assert that, as amended herein, Claims 1, 12, 21, 28 and 39 comply with 35 USC § 112.

UNDER 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) over US Patent No. 6,343,320 to Fairchild, et al. (hereinafter Fairchild). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully asserts that Claims 1-49 are allowable over the Fairchild under 35 USC § 102(e) for the rationale set forth below.

As Applicants understand the reference, Fairchild teaches consolidation of management state information of network devices and sends the information to management servers and management databases. Fairchild at col. 1, ll. 5-10; col. 2 ll. 27-57. The teachings of Fairchild and the embodiments of the present invention recited herein differ.

Claims 1, 12, 21, 28 and 39 are independent. Claims 2-11, 13-20, 22-27, 29-38 and 40-49 respectively depend on independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 28 and 39 and thus incorporate each and every one of their respective recited elements. Claims 1, 12, 21, 28 and 39 are amended herein, all after a similar fashion as exemplified by the reproduction of Claim 1 shown below for the Examiner's convenience, with underlining added for emphasis.

1. A method for fault management in a distributed network management station comprising:
 - initiating a first device coupled to a network, wherein said first device comprises at least one of a single processing element device, a computing system, and a blade type computing system compliant with a compact peripheral component interconnect (PCI) chassis;
 - broadcasting from said first device an information packet to a plurality of devices coupled to the network, wherein said information packet helps define one of said devices a master device for said network; and
 - resolving status of said first device coupled to said network, wherein said resolving results in said distributed network management station having said defined master device being one of said first device and said devices.

As amended herein, Claims 1-49 recite that the first device comprises at least one of a single processing element device, a computing system, and a blade type computing system compliant with a compact peripheral component interconnect (PCI) chassis. That the first device can be one or more of a variety of computing devices accords the embodiments recited herein with the advantages of flexibility and versatility.

Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in Fairchild that is directed to a first network device comprising at least one of a single processing element device, a computing system, and a blade type computing system compliant with a compact PCI chassis, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the Fairchild reference fails to anticipate or suggest the claimed embodiments recited herein. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-49 are allowable over the cited reference under 35 USC § 102(e).

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments and remarks overcome all rejections and objections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-49) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-49) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our USPTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Dated: Feb. 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP



LAWRENCE R. GOERKE

Reg. No. 45,927

Attorney at Law

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Tel. (408) 938-9060

Fax: (408) 938-9069

Email: lgoerke(at)wmhpatents(dot)com